UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and
Social Council

Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/SR.27
30 August 2001

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

SUB-COMMISSION ON THE PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Fifty-third session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 27th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 16 August 2001, at 3 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr. WEISSBRODT

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within a week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Sub-Commission at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

GE. *0110575*

ENG

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS (*continued*)

Draft resolutions and decisions relating to item 6 of the agenda (*continued*)

Draft decision E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/L.2

Draft decision E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/L.36 (Human rights and weapons of mass destruction, or with indiscriminate effect, or of a nature to cause superfluous injury or unnecessary suffering) and the amendment thereto (E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/L.36) (*continued*)

1. Ms. HAMPSON recalled that the sponsors of draft decision L.2 and of draft amendment L.36 had been requested to consider the possibility of arriving at a compromise. In that spirit, she wished to make a further proposal for amending draft decision L.2 so that it would read along the following lines: "At its ... meeting, on ... August 2001, the Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, recalling its resolutions 1997/36 and 1997/37 of 28 August 1977, decided to authorize Mr. Y.K.Y. Sik Yuen to prepare, without financial implications, in the context of human rights and humanitarian norms the working paper, originally assigned to the former Sub-Commission member Ms. Clemencia Forero Ucros in resolution 1997/36,

a) assessing the utility, scope and structure of a study on the real and potential dangers to the effective enjoyment of human rights caused by the testing, production, storage, transfer and trafficking or use of weapons of mass destruction or with indiscriminate effect and

b) studying the implications of human rights law, notably the protection of the right to life, the prohibition of cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment, the protection of the home, including the environment, for the actual and possible use of conventional weapons, including those containing depleted uranium,

and to present the working document to the Sub-Commission at its fifty-fourth session."

2. The proposal was prompted by the fact that depleted uranium, which was only an ingredient, could not in itself be regarded as a weapon of mass destruction. That having been said, the draft decision provided for a study to be made of the consequences of using depleted uranium from the point of view of the law relating to human rights and humanitarian norms.

3. Mr. ALFONSO MARTÍNEZ said that in his view the latest proposal was totally unacceptable, if only because it took for granted that the Sub-Commission considered weapons containing depleted uranium to be conventional weapons and not weapons of mass destruction or with completely unforeseeable effects. He was therefore opposed to the proposal.

4. Ms. WARZAZI said that there was a substantial difference between paragraphs (a) and (b) of the wording just proposed made by Ms. Hampson: in the former, a study of the real and potential dangers associated with certain weapons was envisaged, whereas, in the latter, the Special Rapporteur was requested merely to study the effects of human rights legislation. She would therefore support the draft decision as amended orally during the previous meeting and would vote against the amendment submitted by Ms. Hampson.

5. Mr. JOINET said that he was in favour of the latest draft amendment: while abiding by the spirit of the draft decision, it clarified what the general thrust of the requested study should be. As to whether or not weapons containing depleted uranium were weapons of mass destruction, it would be for the Special Rapporteur to enlighten the Sub-Commission regarding that question.

6. Ms. HAMPSON said that in the study a distinction should be made between weapons of mass destruction, which were covered by special regimes, and conventional weapons, with regard to which it would be necessary to determine whether or not they could be used in such a manner as to produce indiscriminate effects. She therefore hoped that the members of the Sub-Commission would vote for her amendment proposal.

7. *A vote by show of hands was taken on the amendment proposed by Ms. Hampson.*

8. *The amendment proposed by Ms. Hampson was rejected by 14 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.*

9. *A vote by show of hands was taken on draft decision E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/L.2 as amended orally during the 26th meeting.*

10. *Draft decision E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/L.2, as amended, was adopted by 21 votes to 2.*

Draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/L.26 (The question of the transfer and use of small arms and light weapons in the context of human rights and humanitarian norms) (*continued*)

11. Mr. EIDE said that, following consultations, the sponsors had decided to amend the last part of draft decision L.26 so that it read: "... to entrust Ms. Barbara Frey with the task of preparing, without financial implications, a working paper on (a) the trade in and carrying of small arms and light weapons, and (b) the use of such weapons in the context of human rights and humanitarian norms, for submission to the Sub-Commission at its fifty-fourth session". The phrase "especially by law enforcement officials" had been deleted.

12. Mr. JOINET said that he wished to co-sponsor the draft decision, since he had received an assurance that the report would also cover the harmful role of pressure groups, which, in certain countries, opposed the establishment of regulations to control the purchase and carrying of weapons.

13. Mr. GUISSÉ, Mr. SORABJEE, Mr. SIK YUEN and Mr. GÓMEZ-ROBLEDO VERDUZCO said that they wished to co-sponsor the draft decision.

14. *Draft decision E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/L.26, as amended orally, was adopted.*

Draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/L.37 (State cooperation with United Nations human rights mechanisms) (*continued*)

15. Ms. WARZAZI urged the sponsors of the draft resolution to withdraw it. Otherwise, she would formally propose that the Sub-Commission postpone consideration of the draft resolution to its next session.

16. Ms. HAMPSON contested the argument, put forward during the previous meeting by Mr. Alfonso Martínez, that the draft resolution would result in an encroachment on the sovereignty of States as it would oblige them to accept visits by thematic rapporteurs. Countries were perfectly free not to ratify a treaty or not to accept the visit of a special rapporteur. The point was simply that, if a special rapporteur requested a government to authorize a visit by him/her and the visit did not take place before a certain date, the country in question was inscribed in the list of countries in which the human rights situation was being examined by the Commission.

17. Mr. KARTASHKIN said that it was operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution L.37 which was creating problems and proposed that it be deleted.

18. Mr. FAN Guaxiang said that he had serious reservations about draft resolution L.37, which, in his view, mixed up several concepts. The fact that the visit of a working group or a special rapporteur to a given country had not taken place could in no way be regarded as a massive violation of human rights. Similarly, the wish to examine the human rights situation in a country on the grounds that that country had not ratified a given instrument was due to the mingling of several different concepts. Moreover, as the Commission had recommended to the Sub-Commission that it not examine the human rights situation in countries, he did not see why the Sub-Commission was recommending to the Commission new criteria as a basis for examining the situation of human rights in specific countries.

19. Ms. HAMPSON proposed, after consulting with the sponsors of the draft resolution, the adjournment of the debate on the matter in accordance with rule 49 of the Guidelines for the application by the Sub-Commission of the rules of procedure of the functional commissions of the Economic and Social Council.

20. Mr. KARTASHKIN said that he was opposed to an adjournment of the debate and that, if the decision to adjourn was taken, he would in his own name submit draft resolution L.37 minus operative paragraph 6, in accordance with rule 53 of the Guidelines.

21. The CHAIRPERSON said that rule 53 of the Guidelines could not be invoked in the present case since it applied to the withdrawal of a proposal or a motion and not to the adjournment of the debate.

22. *Following an exchange of views in which* Ms. WARZAZI, Mr. YIMER, Ms. HAMPSON, Mr. KARTASHKIN, Mr. GUISSÉ, Mr. SORABJEE, Mr. YOKOTA and Mr. ALFONSO MARTÍNEZ participated, *the debate on draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/L.37 was adjourned.*

Draft decision E/CN.4/Sub.2/ 2001/L.34 (Positive effect of work relating to specific situations)

23. Ms. HAMPSON said that the sponsors of the draft decision had decided to withdraw it.

24. *Draft decision E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/L.34 was withdrawn.*

Draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/L.39 (the right to return of internally displaced persons and refugees) (*continued*)

25. Ms. HAMPSON said that the amendments to the third paragraph of the preamble and to operative paragraphs 2 and 9 proposed during the previous meeting by Mr. Sik Yuen were surprising, since their effect would be that the right to compensation would be enjoyed only by displaced persons whose property had not been destroyed, who constituted only a minority. Moreover, it would run counter to the freedom of movement to delete the phrase "or they can voluntarily settle elsewhere" in operative paragraph 10, since the purpose of that phrase was to prevent displaced persons being forced to settle at a location where they were not safe and which they could not leave of their own free will. In addition, she was opposed to the deletion of operative paragraph 11; the purpose of the version of that paragraph which had been amended by the co-sponsors was to prevent attempts to convince members of the indigenous population of Diego Garcia, for example, to renounce all their rights to their land in exchange for British citizenship, it being envisaged that independent and impartial observers would verify that the displaced persons were accepting the proposed compensation of their own free will.

26. In her view, the draft resolution, as amended by the sponsors, effectively protected the right of return of refugees and internally displaced persons, and she hoped that the Sub-Commission would adopt it.

27. The CHAIRPERSON invited four persons for and four persons against the draft resolution to present their arguments before a vote was taken on the text.

28. Mr. SIK YUEN, supported by Mr. SORABJEE, asked what authorities would be responsible for determining that property could not be restituted and that displaced persons were really exercising their free will. Also, he wondered whether the impossibility of restituting property might not be used against the inhabitants of the island of Diego Garcia who had been displaced and could not invoke their right of return. In his view, operative paragraph 11 applied particularly to the inhabitants of islands and could give rise to abuses, since it authorized renunciation of the right to compensation in transactions which could harm the persons concerned by nullifying their right of return.

29. Ms. DAES expressed support for the draft resolution as amended. In response to the question as to what authorities would take decisions relating to compensation, she said that, in practice, it was competent national courts which decided to grant compensation in cases where return was not possible.

30. Mr. PREWARE said that he had requested that his name be deleted from the list of co-sponsors of the draft resolution, since he had been convinced by the arguments of certain experts that many of the provisions might give rise to interpretation disputes and therefore harm the persons whom this text was meant to benefit.

31. Mr. PINHEIRO, inviting support for the draft resolution, said that part of it had been directly inspired by experiences which he had had as an observer in various countries. The question of the restitution of the property of refugees and displaced persons was a very topical one and the subject of growing attention on the part of international and regional organizations, since the thorny problems that arose in that area represented a major obstacle to return.

32. Ms. HAMPSON said that the draft resolution had been examined by the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees, which had also taken note of the amendments; that was a guarantee of its political neutrality. Moreover, operative paragraph 2 could not, after being amended, be interpreted to mean that compensation would prevent return; reparation was foreseen only if the property in question had been destroyed and could not be restituted. In the case of the island of Diego Garcia, there was theoretically no obstacle to restitution and the return of the inhabitants of the island. The United Kingdom should therefore give up its base and restore the land to its original state.

33. With regard to operative paragraph 11, the sponsors did not have any particular group of persons in mind, but the hundreds of millions of refugees and displaced persons who could not institute reparation proceedings as they did not have access to the property which they had lost. As to confirmation by an independent and impartial observer, it would be a good idea to request the services of the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees, which was well qualified to do the job in question.

34. Mr. GUISSÉ reminded the Secretariat that he had requested that his name be withdrawn from the list of co-sponsors of the draft resolution.

35. Mr. ALFONSO MARTÍNEZ said that he did not support the draft resolution and that he shared the views expressed by the Rapporteur, Mr. Preware. It related to very different situations that could not all be dealt with in the same way. The case of refugees was completely different from that of internally displaced persons, and the context varied from country to country. He would like to see the draft resolution withdrawn. If it were put to the vote, he would not be able to vote for it.

36. Mr. EIDE said that he fully appreciated the concern expressed by Mr. Sik Yuen; he himself was very familiar with the refugee and displaced person problem which Mr. Sik Yuen had in mind, especially in the context of the former Yugoslavia, and believed that it must be addressed. The guarantees proposed by Ms. Hampson should be satisfactory. Hence, given the urgent nature of the problem, he hoped that the Sub-Commission would adopt the draft resolution.

37. Mr. YIMER recalled that, when responding to Mr. Sik Yuen, Ms. Hampson had referred to the situation on the island of Diego Garcia—thereby touching on what was for Africa a very sensitive point. How could she assert that the draft resolution under consideration had no political implications?

38. Ms. HAMPSON said that she had referred to a specific situation because a specific problem had been raised and because she wished to show that the amended text would not have a negative impact on the situation in question. If a specific situation had not been referred to, she would have confined herself to general comments regarding the right of return of refugees and internally displaced persons. The Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees would certainly not have approved a text concerning specific situations.

39. Mr. FAN, explaining his vote before the vote, said that he would vote against the draft resolution. It was undoubtedly meant to promote respect for human rights, but there were cases where invoking human rights was unwise. Having listened to Ms. Hampson's explanation regarding the draft resolution and the amendments to it, he was convinced that questions relating to the human rights of refugees and internally displaced persons could not be isolated from their particular historical and geographic contexts. Human rights were not something vague. They related to very specific situations.

40. *A vote by show of hands was taken on draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/L.39, as amended.*

41. *Draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/L.39 was rejected by 11 votes to 9, with 3 abstentions.*

42. Mr. PARK said that, as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution, he had voted for it. He was very concerned about the right of return of refugees and internally displaced persons to their home countries. However, he fully appreciated the points raised by Mr. Sik Yuen, especially those concerning the implications which the draft resolution might have for his country.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/L.29 (International cooperation in the detection, arrest, extradition and punishment of persons guilty of crimes against humanity)

43. Mr. BENGOA recalled that the first amendment proposed was to change the title so that it would be the same as that of General Assembly resolution 3074 (XXVIII), which referred to "persons guilty of war crimes and crimes against humanity"—not just persons guilty of crimes against humanity; the same change should be made in the body of the draft resolution wherever reference was made to crimes against humanity. In operative paragraph 2, the words "persons guilty of" should be replaced by the words "persons found guilty of". In operative paragraph 3, the words "before an independent impartial tribunal, in conformity with the requirements of due process," should be inserted after the words "shall be subject to trial"; they should be placed in brackets so as to show that they had not been taken from the quoted General Assembly resolution. Mr. Joinet would present amendments relating to the French version.

44. Mr. YOKOTA said that the draft resolution did not create any particular problems for him, except that in his view operative paragraph 4 did not accord with international law. He proposed that it be amended to read "*Affirms* that States should cooperate in the arrest, extradition, trial and punishment of persons guilty of crimes against humanity, including former heads of State or Government, keeping in mind the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and

generally recognized norms of international law". The question was not a political one, but simply one of interpreting international law.

45. Ms. HAMPSON suggested to Mr. Yokota that in the amendment proposed by him the word "should" be replaced by "have an obligation to".

46. Mr. JOINET supported the amendment proposed by Mr. Yokota, as modified by Ms. Hampson.

47. As to the title of the draft resolution, he considered that it would be appropriate to use the title of the General Assembly resolution, as suggested by Mr. Bengoa. With regard to the detailed drafting, both of the title and of the main text, he would leave it to the editors to draw upon the text of the General Assembly resolution.

48. The Sub-Commission members with a Roman Law background and those with an Anglo-Saxon legal background had agreed on how to harmonize the text. In the French version, operative paragraph 2 would read "... en vue de rechercher, arrêter, juger ou extrader et condamner les personnes reconnues coupables de crimes de guerre et de crimes contre l'humanité". In that connection, he recalled the principle of international law that one should try or extradite. Similarly, in operative paragraph 3, the subparagraph starting in the English version with the words "States shall assist each other ..." would read in French as follows: "Les États se prêtent mutuellement leur concours en recherchant, en arrêtant et en traduisant en justice les personnes contre lesquelles existent des charges suffisantes établissant qu'elles ont commis de tels crimes".

49. Mr. SORABJEE, referring to the text just read by Mr. Joinet, proposed that "suffisantes" be replaced by "prima facie"—the words used in the English version of that subparagraph.

50. Ms. HAMPSON proposed replacing the word "detect" in operative paragraph 2 by the words "search for", so as to bring the English version of that paragraph closer into line with the French version.

51. Mr. JOINET said that the same terminology would be used throughout the text and that consequential changes would be made.

52. Ms. ZERROUGUI, referring to the principle of international law mentioned by Mr. Joinet, that States must "arrest, try or extradite", said that account should be taken of it in operative paragraph 5 as well. Also, she said that under international law a State could be obliged to try—but not to extradite—a person.

53. Mr. BENGOA said that there was agreement on the amendments to operative paragraph 4 proposed both by Mr. Yokota and by Ms. Hampson. Also, the expression "crimes against humanity" would be replaced by "war crimes and crimes against humanity" wherever it appeared—in all languages.

54. Mr. YOKOTA said that he wished to co-sponsor the draft resolution.

55. *Draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/L.29 was adopted.*

Draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/L.24 (Study on non-discrimination as enshrined in article 2.2 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

56. Ms. MOTOC said that the French and English versions of Sub-Commission decision 1997/112 (E/CN.4/Sub.2/Dec./1997/112) regarding the criteria to be applied in the carrying out of new studies had been distributed to the members of the Sub-Commission. She proposed an amendment to draft

resolution L.24—the insertion on page 3 of the French version, before the paragraph starting "*Notant avec satisfaction*", of a paragraph reading "*Rappelant* la décision de la Sous-Commission 1997/112 relative aux critères à appliquer pour l'élaboration de nouvelles études".

57. *Draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/L.24, as revised, was adopted.*

58. *Draft decision E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/L.44 was adopted.*

59. Mr. ALFONSO MARTÍNEZ, addressing Ms. Motoc, said that he had never objected to Sub-Commission members carrying out studies at the request of other convention-based bodies. However, he did not see why such studies should receive high priority. A decision to carry out a new study should be taken either in response to a request made by the Commission on Human Rights or on the initiative of the Sub-Commission itself.

Draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/L.15 (The Social Forum)

60. Mr. GUISSÉ said that he would like draft resolutions and decisions to be translated into French in future so that he could examine them in his mother tongue.

61. Mr. BENGOA presenting the draft resolution, said that it had been drafted by five representatives of different regions for the purpose of specifying aspects of the Social Forum which would be taking place in 2002. In the draft resolution, the Commission on Human Rights was requested to authorize the Sub-Commission to hold a social forum before its session. He proposed an amendment drafted by Mr. Kartashkin—the insertion in operative paragraph 3 of an initial subparagraph reading "The interaction between civil and political and economic, social and cultural rights;". He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

62. Mr. YIMER said that he wished to co-sponsor the draft resolution. At the same time, he asked Mr. Bengoa whether it would be possible to recast operative paragraph 3, which he considered to be too detailed, so as to give the Special Forum greater autonomy in the selection of questions to be examined by it.

63. Mr. BENGOA said that operative paragraph 3 reflected the proposal made by the experts at the preparatory meeting on the Special Forum regarding specific themes, such as the right to food, to be covered in the discussions during the Scientific Forum which would be taking place in 2002, and which would have poverty as its general theme. In that connection, the Scientific Forum should follow, from the human rights point of view, the discussions that would be taking place soon in other international bodies.

64. Ms. HAMPSON proposed that in operative paragraph 3 of the English version of the draft resolution "in general" be replaced by "*inter alia*". With regard to operative paragraph 7, she said that the different entities enumerated there should be invited not only to submit studies to the Social Forum but also to participate in it.

65. Ms. ZERROUGUI enquired after the meaning of the English word "advocates" in the penultimate paragraph of the preamble and of the English word "destitution" in operative paragraph 2 (*b*). With regard to operative paragraph 8, she asked whether it made sense to try communicating with the most vulnerable by electronic means.

66. Ms. MOTOC said that the points raised by Ms. Zerrougui had also been raised during the discussions which had taken place among the representatives of the regional groups.

67. Mr. EIDE supported the proposal made by Mr. Yimer with a view to introducing greater flexibility into operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution; by the same token, he proposed

replacing "*Decides*" by "*Recommends*". He supported the idea, put forward by Ms. Hampson, of inviting the various United Nations and other entities to participate in the Social Forum. Lastly, he proposed the deletion of the word "electronic" in operative paragraph 8, the idea behind which was that there should be consultation with vulnerable groups by either electronic or other means; electronic consultation could be useful in certain cases.

68. The CHAIRPERSON proposed the formulation "electronic and other consultation" for operative paragraph 8.

69. Ms. DAES thanked the co-sponsors of the draft resolution for their spirit of cooperation and for the flexibility demonstrated by them. She expressed support for all the amendment proposals made by Messrs. Bengoa, Eide and Yimer. With regard to the eighth preambular paragraph, she proposed that the words "the need to listen to the most vulnerable and their advocates" be replaced by the words "the need to be informed about the situation of the most vulnerable groups". She said that she wished to co-sponsor the draft resolution.

70. Mr. YIMER, supported by Mr. Bengoa, said that he welcomed Mr. Eide's proposal that the word "*Recommends*" be used in operative paragraph 3. With regard to operative paragraph 3 (g), he felt that the word "affairs" should be replaced by a more appropriate word. He said that he wished to co-sponsor the draft resolution.

71. Ms. HAMPSON, referring to the eighth preambular paragraph, said that in her view the present version was more appropriate. The wording proposed by Ms. Daes suggested that the information in question could derive from different sources, whereas the present version established a direct link with the most vulnerable. The present version was all the more appropriate in that the English word "advocates" did not merely correspond to the French word "avocats"; it also meant the defenders of a particular group, idea or person. She welcomed the proposed use of the word "*Recommends*" at the beginning of operative paragraph 3. Referring to operative paragraph 7, she proposed that the words "to participate in and" be inserted before the words "to submit". Lastly, she supported Ms. Zerrougui's proposal that the word "electronic" be deleted in operative paragraph 8.

72. Ms. WARZAZI, referring to operative paragraph 8, said that the expression "effective means" would give the High Commissioner for Human Rights the possibility of using the most appropriate means of contacting and consulting the most vulnerable.

73. Mr. BENGOA said that the English word "advocate" was admittedly difficult to define, but nowadays it was being used very widely. Like Ms. Hampson, he would prefer to see the words "*inter alia*" used at the beginning of operative paragraph 3. The word "affairs" in operative paragraph 3 (g) had no particular technical meaning and could easily be replaced by a word such as "issues" or "matters". He welcomed the amendments to operative paragraphs 7 and 8 that had been proposed. At the same time, he pointed out that the associations which represented the most vulnerable had access to the Internet, as demonstrated by the experience of indigenous groups. In future, it would be interesting to communicate with such groups through a virtual forum.

74. Mr. PINHEIRO said that he liked the idea of a virtual forum; it was necessary to keep up with the times. Also, it should be borne in mind that the non-governmental organizations would not have been able to express their demands if they had not been able to use electronic means of communication, as they had been in many Latin American countries.

75. Ms. ZERROUGUI said that she was in favour of using electronic means of consultation, especially if they were already being used in certain countries, but they should not be the sole means.

76. Ms. WARZAZI proposed the insertion of "consultation, including" between "ensuring" and "electronic" in operative paragraph 8.

77. Messrs. BENGOA, EIDE and PREWARE supported the proposal made by Ms. Warzazi.

78. Mr. GÓMEZ-ROBLEDO VERDUZCO, Mr. GUISSÉ, Ms. HAMPSON, Mr. Van HOOF, Mr. JOINET, Mr. KARTASHKIN, Mr. OGURTSOV, Mr. PARK, Mr. SIK YUEN, Ms. WARZAZI and Ms. ZERROUGUI said that they wished to co-sponsor the draft resolution.

79. Mr. JOINET recalled that the French version of the text had not been examined.

80. *Draft resolution E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/L.15 was adopted in the English version, as amended.*

81. Mr. PARK, supported by Ms. Hampson, drew the attention of the Sub-Commission members to the note by the secretariat E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/19. That note contained, in effect, a negative response by the Secretariat's Office of Legal Affairs to the Sub-Commission's resolution 2000/15. In that resolution, the Sub-Commission had requested the High Commissioner for Human Rights to promote the establishment, in the Office of Legal Affairs, of a database on national legislation on matters of relevance to indigenous peoples.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.